



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,550	12/28/2000	Dhananjay V. Kesar	PM 0273216 P10417	6959

27496 7590 02/26/2004

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
725 S. FIGUEROA STREET
SUITE 2800
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

EXAMINER

PHAN, RAYMOND NGAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/750,550

Applicant(s)

KESKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Phan

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 34-37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on December 17, 2003.
2. This application has been examined. Claims 1-37 are pending.
3. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2111.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birkler et al. (US No. 6,466,951) in view of Kraay et al. (US No. 6,202,068).

In regard to claims 1, 16, 23, Birkler et al. disclose a system for allowing items related to an example item to be found, comprising at least one relationship agent contained in a first electronic (i.e. PC) that automatically builds relationship

information between different items (see col. 3, line 54 through col. 4, line 21); an item relationship database formed by at least one relationship agent, the database including the relationship information between different items (see col. 4, lines 26-45); a synchronizer that transfers the item relationship database or a portion thereof, from the first electronic device to the second electronic device (i.e. PDA); and logic embedded in the second electronic device that uses the relationship information in the item relationship database to find item related to the example item (see col. 4, lines 3-44); user interface on the second electronic device to accept input of the example item (see col. 4, lines 26-44). But Birkler et al. do not specifically disclose at least one relationship agent contained in the electronic device that automatically builds relationship information about data residing in different applications on the electronic device. However Kraay et al. disclose at least one relationship agent contained in the electronic device that automatically builds relationship information about data residing in different applications on the electronic device (see col. 4, line 65 through col. 5, line 66); querying for data related to the example datum (see col. 6, line 58 through col. 7, line 54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Kraay et al. into the teachings of Birkler et al. because it would provide an efficient and expedient search of an existing database in order to reveal underlying patterns and obscure, latent relationships among individual data elements.

In regard to claim 2, Birkler et al. disclose wherein the first electronic device is a PC and the second electronic device is a PDA (see col. 3, lines 2-16).

In regard to claims 3, 12, 17, 24, Birkler et al. disclose wherein the second electronic device is a system with low processing power and limited storage capacity (see col. 3, lines 9-16).

In regard to claims 4, 18, 25, Birkler et al. disclose a user interface mechanism on the second electronic device that allows users to ask for item related to the example item; and display on the second electronic device that illustrates the items to the example item when the user interface mechanism is invoked (see col. 4, lines 26-44).

In regard to claims 5, 19, 26, Birkler et al. disclose further a supporting database to the at least one relationship agent, which allows at least one relationship agent to make a query into the supporting database for finding the relationship information of the particular item (see col. 3, line 54 through col. 4, line 21).

In regard to claims 6, 13, 27, Birkler et al. disclose wherein the relationship information (i.e. calendar information) is built based on criteria including at least one of temporal relevance, content relevance and people relevance (see col.4, line 56 through col. 5, line 30).

In regard to claims 7, 14, 20, Birkler et al. disclose wherein the item relationship database includes a document table for storing type and location of information of particular item and a document relation table for storing correlation among sets of different items and a description of the type of relationship for each set (see col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 10).

In regard to claim 8, Birkler et al. disclose wherein item related to a set of example item are found (see col. 4, lines 13-21).

In regard to claims 9, 21, 28, Birkler et al. disclose wherein the synchronizer allows transfer of an item relationship database, or a portion thereof, from the second electronic device to the first device (see col. 4, lines 26-44).

In regard to claims 10, 15, 22, 29, Birkler et al. disclose further a user interface front end to the item relationship database that allows users to modify the relationship information stored in the item relationship database, set their own relationship information, or set the rules for making the relationship information for the at least one relationship agent (see col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 10). In regard to claim 11, Birkler et al. disclose a system for allowing items related to an example item to be found, comprising at least one relationship agent contained in a first electronic (i.e. PC) that automatically builds relationship information between different items (see col. 3, line 54 through col. 4, line 21); an item relationship database formed by at least one relationship agent, the database including the relationship information between different items (see col. 4, lines 26-45); a synchronizer that transfers the item relationship database or a portion thereof, from the first electronic device to the second electronic device (i.e. PDA); and logic embedded in the second electronic device that uses the relationship information in the item relationship database to find item related to the example item (see col. 4, lines 3-44). Birkler et al. disclose a user interface mechanism on the second electronic device that allows users to ask for item related to the example item; and display on the second electronic device that illustrates the items to the example item when the user interface mechanism is invoked (see col. 4, lines 26-44). But Birkler et al. do not specifically disclose at least one relationship agent contained in the electronic device that automatically builds relationship information about data residing in different applications on the electronic device.

However Kraay et al. disclose at least one relationship agent contained in the electronic device that automatically builds relationship information about data residing in different applications on the electronic device (see col. 4, line 65 through col. 5, line 66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Kraay et al. into the teachings of Birkler et al. because it would provide an efficient and expedient search of an existing database in order to reveal underlying patterns and obscure, latent relationships among individual data elements.

In regard to claims 30-33, Birkler et al. disclose wherein different application are one of the calendar application, an email application, a to-do list application, a memo application, a contact application (see col. 1, line 64 through col. 2, line 10).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 34-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 34-37 are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art, found any motivation to combine any of the said prior arts which teach wherein the related data are related to the example datum by possessing a same item, the same item being one of the same word contained in the data, same string of words contained in the data, and the same calendar date contained in the data.

Response to Amendment

9. Applicant's arguments, see pages 12-17, filed December 18, 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-29 under 35 USC 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Kraay et al.

Conclusion

10. Claims 1-33 are rejected. Claims 34-37 are objected.

11. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

White et al. (US No. 6,618,732) disclose a database query handler supporting querying of textual annotations of relation between data objects.

Kikkers (US No. 6,678,691) discloses a method and apparatus for generating corporate information.

Frelburger et al. (US No. 6,475,146) disclose method and system for using PDA with diagnostic medical ultrasound systems.

Tognazzimi (US No. 5,790,974) discloses a portable calendar ring device having perceptual agent managing calendar entries.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (703) 306-2756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Primary, Paul Myers can be reached on (703) 305-9656 or via e-mail addressed to paul.myers@uspto.gov. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 746-7239.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver

Art Unit: 2111

of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Raymond Phan

2/21/04

